

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/581,759	MORROW ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Leigh C. Maier	1623	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** after final

(1) Leigh C. Maier.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Russ Widom.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 24 September 2010
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*none*

Claims discussed:

34

Prior art documents discussed:

*none*
**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*Exr inquired about claim 34 to verify that Applicant intended "acetylglucosamine" rather than "acetyllactosamine." The claim recites the former, but from a review of the specification, it appears possible that the latter might actually be intended. Mr Widom confirmed that Applicant intended "acetyllactosamine" and authorized an examiner's amendment to make this change.*

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Assent/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)